

national and security interests in maintaining strong economic links with the Caribbean region.

Secretary Christopher's announcement advances a bipartisan proposal currently before the Congress that will correct the unintended adverse effects of Nafta on the Caribbean Basin. The prospect of enhanced U.S.-Caribbean trade links enjoys wide-spread support, and has been endorsed by many Caribbean heads of government and countless business and community leaders, both in the U.S. and in the Caribbean.

As currently envisioned, the proposal will insure that Caribbean and Mexican exports enjoy equal access to the U.S. market during the next 10 years. During this transitional period of "Nafta parity," Caribbean countries will be required to take reciprocal steps to expand market access for U.S. products, strengthen investment guarantees, expand worker's rights, and improve intellectual property protection. By the end of the 10-year period, the U.S. will have strengthened its commercial relationship with the Caribbean region while the CBI countries will be in a better position to join a hemispheric-wide free Trade Area of the Americas.

The benefits of Nafta parity would be felt strongly over the next few years in both the Caribbean and in the U.S. Presently, the U.S.-Caribbean commercial relationship supports more than 260,000 jobs in the U.S. and countless more throughout the Caribbean. The Caribbean Basin is now the 10th-largest export market for the U.S. and one of the few regions in the world where U.S. exporters maintain trade surpluses. Nafta parity will build on this framework as elevated trade levels generate thousands of new jobs each year in the U.S. and the Caribbean.

The benefits to U.S. industry for this program are clear as well. Nafta parity will enhance international competitiveness of the U.S. textile and apparel industry by building on the productive relationship already enjoyed by U.S. and Caribbean firms. Since Caribbean garment exports rely upon U.S. components and labor for as much as 70% of their value-added, and expansion of the Caribbean garment industry directly benefits U.S. firms and workers. Many Caribbean governments already operate programs that successfully fight illegal textile transshipment from East and South Asian countries, so Nafta parity will strengthen a framework that protects the domestic industry from quota violations. Finally, as Caribbean governments take steps to strengthen intellectual property and investment protections—as Jamaica has already done—many other U.S. industries will gain.

This trading relationship means that overall economic growth and development in the Caribbean Basin can directly translate into expanded export opportunities for the U.S. Roughly 60 cents of each dollar the region earns from exports to the U.S. market is spent in the U.S. buying American-made consumer goods, food products, raw materials and capital equipment.

In this context, Nafta parity has emerged as a cost-effective economic and foreign policy instrument to promote regional development. Increased trade activity will provide many additional commercial opportunities, which are so crucial for healthy economic growth in cities and rural areas throughout the U.S. Stronger trade links will inevitably lead to better cooperation in other areas, such as narcotics interdiction, anticorruption activities, and efforts to fight terrorism and international crime. Moreover, as Caribbean economies prosper, they will become less dependent on U.S. foreign aid at a time when foreign assistance is getting close scrutiny. In many ways, therefore, Nafta parity represents a tangible "trade,

not aid" approach, which has taken on new importance in light of the U.S. budget debate.

Numerous studies have shown that strong regional economic links are crucial not only in creating economic opportunities throughout the U.S. and the Caribbean Basin but also in supporting stable and mutually beneficial security relationships. Congress should advance U.S. national security interests in the region by moving quickly to enact Nafta parity.

SALUTE TO J. DOUGLAS BALCOMB AND HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO RE- NEWABLE ENERGY

HON. DAN SCHAEFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1996

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Department of Energy awarded the John Ericsson Award in Renewable Energy to Dr. J. Douglas Balcomb of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Golden, CO.

A pioneer in the field of solar energy research for 17 years, Dr. Balcomb received his Ph.D. in nuclear engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1961. One of his earliest notable offerings was the solar load ratio technique for qualifying the energy performance of passive and active components and mixed systems. This accomplishment gave the solar energy design community a direct, verifiable method of evaluating solar features—a method that is now used worldwide and has led to the development of many passive-design tools. The American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, and Air Conditioning Engineer's design manual, *Passive Solar Heating Analysis*, is an outgrowth of the method.

Dr. Balcomb's involvement in design has led to a collaboration with the Passive Solar Industries Council and the National Association of Home Builders. The collaboration has produced *Builderguide*, a user-friendly computer-based spreadsheet that calculates locale-specific energy performance and comfort. Dr. Balcomb is now adjusting his basic methodology for residential design to small commercial buildings, thus making the technology widely available in the private sector.

Dr. Balcomb has published over 100 technical papers and lectured in 26 countries on effective passive design and is a past chairman of the American Solar Energy Society.

I congratulate Dr. J. Douglas Balcomb as he receives the prestigious John Ericsson Award in Renewable Energy today for his important work in helping to secure our country's energy future.

IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2202) to amend

the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and deportation law and procedures, by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes:

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this pro-family, pro-immigration amendment.

The issues of legal and illegal immigration are not, and should not, be linked to one another. It is unfortunate that the anger, frustration, and misinformation over illegal immigration has been used to target hard-working, law-abiding, legal immigrants. Focusing our efforts on reducing illegal immigration is a responsible and proper undertaking. Slashing legal immigration, however, as H.R. 2202 does, is like fighting crime by imprisoning the innocent. While the Chrysler-Berman-Brownback amendment does not eliminate all the evils contained in this bill, it does strike some of the most blatantly xenophobic and anti-family provisions of the legislation.

The legislation, as you know, would reduce legal immigration by 40 percent over 5 years. Whole categories of legal immigration would be eliminated and excessive restrictions would be placed on the sponsors of legal immigrants. Under the bill, parents of U.S. citizens would no longer be able to migrate to the United States unless they are covered by health insurance and long-term health care policies, a requirement that is clearly beyond the means of many Americans. It is unconscionable that only the wealthy will be able to bring their parents into this country.

In addition, the bill guarantees that families of legal immigrants will forever remain divided. The unmarried adult sons and daughters of U.S. citizens and legal permanent residents are all but prohibited from joining their parents. Should brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens be able to migrate to the United States and live with one another? Not according to the sponsors of the legislation; under H.R. 2202, this category of immigration is completely eliminated. I ask the supporters of these provisions: Is America not big enough for the parents, children, and siblings of its citizens?

Mr. Chairman, though it has been said several times before, it must be said again. We are a Nation of immigrants. Ours is a proud, though not unblemished, history of providing hope and opportunity to people from all nations who are willing to work hard and abide by our laws. This bill turns that history on its head and does so by striking at one of our most cherished institutions—the nuclear family.

Legal immigrants have provided the United States with a rich return on its investment. Legal immigrants and foreign-born citizens work hard and contribute to the economy well beyond the cost of services that they consume. It is estimated that 77 percent of the foreign-born population is gainfully employed, compared to 74 percent of native-born Americans. In addition, immigrants generate \$285 billion in income and pay more than \$70 billion in taxes annually—\$25 billion more than they receive in benefits. Legal immigrants and naturalized citizens also contribute immeasurably

to the rich mixture of cultures and heritages that can only be found in the United States. I find strength and pride in this diversity, not fear and anxiety.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2202 is, without a doubt, a bill that is bad for America. The Chrysler-Berman-Brownback amendment removes some, but not all, of the draconian measures in the legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and oppose final passage of the bill.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING ASSISTANCE AND SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 1996

HON. RICK LAZIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1996

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to come to this floor today to introduce the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996.

This is the most important piece of legislation this body has ever considered with regard to Indian housing. This bill heralds a new era in the relations between Congress and Indian tribes, one marked by mutual respect, consensus, and accountability on all sides.

Indian communities suffer from some of the worst housing conditions in the country, a situation we will no longer tolerate. New partnerships between the Federal and tribal governments and the private sector will give local Indian communities the tools they need—and have been asking for—to build a better life for themselves and their members.

Indian housing programs began in the early 1960's as a result of memorandums between the Public Housing Administration, the predecessor to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Department of Interior. Housing on Indian reservations was considered just a derivation of public housing, the same as you would find in Seattle, or Miami, or in the town of Islip, N.Y. Indian housing is not public housing. This bill recognizes that fact and creates a single, flexible block grant to tribes or their tribally designated housing entity to provide housing assistance.

Because of the unique government-to-government relationship between Indian tribes and the American Government, as well as the value of having local communities solve local problems. Indian housing authorities should have greater flexibility in providing assistance to their members.

Tribal governments and housing authorities should also have the ability and responsibility to strategically plan their own communities' development, focusing on the long-term health of the community and the results of their work, not over burdened by excessive regulation. Providing the maximum amount of flexibility in the use of housing dollars, within strict accountability standards, is not only a further affirmation of the self-determination of tribes, it allows for innovation and local problem-solving capabilities that are crucial to the success of any community-based strategy.

Involving private markets and private real estate entities must be a part of a successful strategy to improve economic conditions in Indian country. Simply put, we need more bang for our buck if we hope to address the needs of Indian communities in a meaningful way.

The formula-driven block grant allows us to implement a new affordable housing loan guarantee, based on the very successful section 108 loan guarantee for Community Development Block Grant funds. Under this new model, tribes can borrow capital from existing financial organizations and markets to expand the number of new units that can be constructed. This helps alleviate the serious need for new housing units in Indian country and at the same time lets private capital and investors take up the slack where Federal funding cannot, decreasing the dependence on direct subsidies.

While discussion and debate are underway on other legislative initiatives such as NAFSO, the Native American Financial Services Organization, we can take steps now to ensure public dollars going to tribes for housing can be used to leverage private dollars.

The bill also lengthens leases on trust-held land to 40 years. While it may not seem important, it is crucial to the secondary mortgage market to have lease terms long enough to support a 30-year mortgage. This kind of involvement by the private sector—supporting homeownership—is precisely the kind of efforts this Congress must support and it's one of the reasons this bill is so important to Indian country. Fannie Mae is just beginning to become involved in Indian country through the purchase of section 184 loans; Freddie Mac is poised to do the same. I believe this provision will give them added incentive to increase their presence in Indian communities.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Mr. BE-REUTER, the distinguished vice-chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, my good friend Mr. HAYWORTH, and our colleague from the other side of the aisle, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Their efforts are much appreciated and I look forward to their continued input on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is only the beginning. As the bill moves forward, we expect to receive even more input from people who benefit from and run housing programs and, most importantly, to consult with tribal leaders. I am confident that the administration and the other body will support this bill and I look forward to working with them to make sure we can have the best possible legislation.

HONORING FBI AGENT CHARLES L. REED

HON. JON D. FOX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1996

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a hero in the war on drugs from my home district in Montgomery County, PA.

Recently, FBI special agent Charles L. Reed was laid to rest after giving his life to free our community from the yoke of drug abuse. Thousands of State troopers, police officers from throughout the region, park rangers, and transit police joined the friends, family, and colleagues to thank agent Reed, offer condolences from a grateful community to his family, and bid farewell to an exemplary public servant.

The outpouring of grief for this fallen hero was tremendous in a community which knew

the benefit of the good work he did on behalf of the people. Hundreds of FBI agents, their badges draped in black, filled the parking lot of the church in tribute to their fallen comrade who was killed recently in a shootout with a drug dealer.

Six young pallbearers, all relatives of agent Reed, carried his body to its rest with the mournful wail of bagpipes in the background. That languished sound of the bagpipes reflected the mood of the entire Delaware Valley community over the death of this 45-year-old hero. The pain reflected on the faces of agent Reed's wife and three young sons was etched in the spirit of our entire community. For a great man died in defense of his community, locked in a mortal struggle against the specter of drugs which has ravaged this Nation for so long.

Agent Reed was not just a dedicated law enforcer, he was a devoted, loving, and proud husband, father, and friend who loved his community so much he was willing to risk his life in its service.

At the funeral, Gerald Loke who worked with agent Reed for 12 years at the FBI office in Lansdale, Montgomery County said: "The FBI gave Chuck the title of special agent. Today, I want to give him the title of special husband, special father, and special friend."

FBI Director Louis Freeh recounted a story agent Reed often told about a Vermont milkman he knew growing up. The milkman's hands were deformed by his work, but he continued the job he loved. Agent Reed often compared his passion for FBI work to the milkman's. He even named his youngest son, Kelley, 17, after the milkman.

Director Freeh told agent Reed's three sons, Joshua, 21, Todd, 18, and Kelley that they should remember their father as a hero. His wife, Susan, became a source of strength for his bereaved colleagues, knowing the impact this loss would have on them. Her courage matched his own.

Mr. Speaker, the tragic impact of drugs on this Nation is never made more clear than when a community loses one of its own. The children who become hooked and die with an overdose in their veins; the innocent bystanders who lose their lives as a result of the crime which follows this plague. These are the people agent Charles Reed died for. These are the tragedies he worked so hard to prevent. In the end, the war on drugs would claim another soldier. But despite his death, his message lives on in the dedication of his coworkers, in the love of his wife, in the future of his children, and in the appreciation of a community clothed in grief.

I rise today to honor agent Charles L. Reed—a hero to his community, a role model to his coworkers, and martyr in the war on drugs. May we never again lose such a man to this insidious tragedy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

CONGRATULATIONS TO BROCK SANDERS

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Brock